Committee Members Present:

Rachael Bisnett  Libby Hill  Tim Patton
Thomas Carey  Victoria Hutchen  Nicolai Schousboe*
Tom Cushing  Joe Jaskulski  Tim Schwartz
Jack Darin  Nathan Kipnis  William E. Siegfriedt*
Deanna Dworak  Diego Klabjan  Jeff Smith
Joel Freeman  Kristin Landry  William Wagner
Kevin Glynn  Richard Lanyon  Fred Wittenberg

* Committee Co-Chair

Staff Present:
Wally Bobkiewicz, City Manager
Catherine Hurley, Sustainable Programs Coordinator

Guests Present:
Mayor Tisdahl
Robyn Gabel, District 18 State Representative

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM
A quorum being present, Sustainable Programs Coordinator Catherine Hurley called the meeting to order at 6:02 pm.

2. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES
None

3. COMMITTEE REPORTS
None

4. STAFF REPORTS
None

5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
None

6. NEW BUSINESS
A. Welcome and review of agenda and meeting goals

Ms. Hurley welcomed all attendees to the meeting and thanked the City Manager, Wally Bobkiewicz and Mayor Tisdahl for joining the meeting. Mayor Tisdahl welcomes the committee members and introduced Robyn Gabel, District 18 State Representative. Representative Gabel expressed her thanks to the committee for volunteering their time and stated that she was excited about the offshore wind development project. Representative Gabel said that the State of Illinois owns the lake bed in Lake Michigan and the State is responsible for the rules to lease out the lake bed.
Working with the Mayor and members of the community, Representative Gabel worked to introduce House Bill 1558 “The Lake Michigan Offshore Wind Energy Council Act” to create a council under the Illinois Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) with the goal of developing a process and legislation to lease the lake bed for offshore wind development. The bill passed out of the House and is now in the Illinois Senate. Representative Gabel will be working through some proposed amendments which are concerned with the public trust and need to proceed responsibly when concerning uses of Lake Michigan. Initial feedback from the IDNR was that they would feel comfortable with the City playing a role in the lease process due to their ability to keep the public trust in mind.

B. Introductions

Ms. Hurley asked that the committee members each introduce themselves and give a brief overview of their background experience and their feedback on the three points presented with the Request for Information materials sent out ahead of the meeting. The three points included one good aspect presented in at least one RFI that should be carried through in future discussions, one aspect missing from the responses to the RFI that should be focused on in future inquires, and one question related to the offshore wind generation project that you hope to learn from the committee during the process.

Summary of feedback/input from the committee during this process is summarized below.

1. Good Aspects presented in at least one RFI that should be carried through in future discussions

   Effort - It was acknowledged that both respondents put forth effort into their documents and subsequent presentation to City Council and their effort was appreciated. In addition, the Mercury Wind response to the RFI was detailed and attempted to address all the elements that were requested.

   Operations and Maintenance – One of the RFI responses provided a pretty thorough description of operations and maintenance considerations. It was acknowledged that an important consideration for this project is thinking about the long-term servicing needs of the infrastructure once it is constructed.

   Decommissioning – The topic of decommissioning was discussed in one of the RFI responses and this is an important aspect of the project that should be considered more fully in the future.

   Feasibility Study – Both RFI responses talked about the need for a feasibility study as an important future step in further development of an offshore wind development project. One aspect of the feasibility study is a wind resource study that would take 1-2 years of data collection to complete. This task is something that could be undertaken early on in the process, potentially with the help of grant money.

   Technology – One respondent recommended a traditional technology while the other recommended an emerging technology. There are advantages of each approach and this
topic of best technology or state of the art technology is one that should continue in future discussions.

2. One aspect missing from the responses to the RFI that should be focused on in future inquiries

Cost, Revenue, and Financing – It would be helpful to understand how the offshore wind might generate revenue for the City or for the owner of the project, such as through renewable energy credits. In addition, the costs need to be broken down in similar ways so a clear cost comparison can be made between the two RFI responses. Finally, financing sources for this type of project and the key players that would be involved need to be fully explained.

Pre-development outreach – This was lacking in the RFI responses and needs to be more fully considered and planned out. There are still a lot of people in the community who are not fully aware of the facts and more effort will be needed of this to gain community wide support.

Permitting – The permitting schedule was either not provided or presented over-optimistic permit review and approval times; way too short based on the case studies from other projects based in the United States.

City’s Role and Responsibility – Both of the RFI responses had contradictory statements about the City’s role and responsibility on the project. This needs to be articulated more clearly.

Wind Resource Assumptions - The need for a wind resource assessment during the feasibly phase cannot be over emphasized. Both RFI responses made a lot of assumptions about available wind resources and this needs to be researched in detail before conclusions can be made on the realistic amount of wind available.

Maintenance and Safety – More information is needed on safety procedures and considerations related to the maintenance and operations of the wind turbine equipment. OSHA is in the process of developing safety requirements for wind farms because there have been some past issues with deaths associated with wind farm maintenance activities in the past. In addition, the breakdown of maintenance personnel recommended in one of the RFI responses was not adequate.

Insurance and Risk – There needs to be more discussion on the insurance requirements for this type of project and where the risk and uncertainty lies.

Scope of the Project – There is no discussion about how this project could be expanded beyond the borders of Evanston or increased in size over time.

Equipment Sourcing and Supply Chain – Both RFI responses need to better address the local supply chain and sourcing of the equipment. So many of the parts for this type of project are not being created in the United States and the generation of local jobs or regional impact needs to be considered.

Qualifications and Past Experience - Both companies who submitted a response to the RFI are lacking qualifications to do a project of this magnitude. It would be helpful to hear from the 9 other interested parties.
3. Question related to the offshore wind generation project that you hope to learn from the committee during the process

Benefits - What are the benefits of this project and how would the various parties benefit? Is there an opportunity to tie this project into other improvements along the lake front? We need credible things that will benefit Evanston. Are there benefits to the city playing a larger role as opposed to a small one? In the past, municipal governments have played a larger role in the development of public infrastructure such as water treatment, roadways, etc. where public benefit was clear. What is the public benefit from this project?

Cost - How much is this project really going to cost and how would it be financed? What are the various financing options? Will this lower our taxes? People will still be excited that we are leading the way but may have reservations. Both RFI responses mentioned the Power Purchase Agreement (PPA). What will the PPA mean to the actual end users? What impact will this have on pricing? If it does have an impact, it needs to be communicated.

Implementation - What is the process, both political and regulatory, that would need to be taken to implement this project? What will the environmental impacts be? People will wonder if there are any bad things that could happen as a result from this. What is involved with making the land-based connection? One RFI response mentioned necessary staging space and permanent space needed at the lake front. To what extent will this impact residents? How much space is needed and for how long? What is the time frame for construction once all regulatory requirements and permitting is obtained.

City’s Role and Responsibility - Who are the players involved in this type of project and what would they be responsible for? What are the options for the role that the City of Evanston could play in this project? How far does the City want to go with this project?

Partnerships - Would like to learn more about why Evanston is doing this in isolation? Can we do this beyond the boarders of Evanston? What other project partners should or could Evanston partner with, such as other lakefront communities (Wilmette, Winnetka, etc.)?

RFI Respondents - Who were the other qualified companies that made inquires but did not submit a response? What could the City of Evanston do to engage them in this process? What was the process used to advertise this RFI? The responses to the RFI were not from companies with extensive experience. This may have been the cause of factual errors omissions, and incorrect assumptions noted in the RFI responses. Why did experienced firms not submit responses to the RFI? What should be changed in the future for additional inquires? What things could the City bundle into a “carrot” to entice the interest of more experienced developers. In other words, what value added things can the City realistically do to help make the project attractive to developers? Examples might be intergovernmental relationships with state and federal level representatives (e.g. government legislators, the Army Corps of Engineers, etc.).

Could development of this project open the project developer to lawsuits?

What can we learn from Europe and Cape Wind in Massachusetts?

C. Overview of committee goals and expectations
Mr. Siegfriedt stated that the goal of the committee is to review the information provided by the two RFI respondents and provide feedback to the city council. He stated that the committee will probably go a little farther than that and the group will offer recommendations to the City on the path forward. Commenting on the RFI responses is important and a key issue will be to correct or clarify the factual errors that were presented in the RFI responses.

A question was raised about how confident the committee was related to how much wind was available at the proposed project site. Mr. Siegfriedt stated that the question of wind resources was not something that the committee would address specifically. He said that previous Citizens' Greener Evanston (CGE) indicated that there was likely available wind resources but that this determination was the business of the wind developer. The developer would be responsible for a study to determine wind resources as part of the feasibility process and to help obtain the information needed to secure loan financing. It was also stated that the City could spend money to do a wind resources study however that was an activity typically undertaken by wind farm developers.

It was also asked what are the things that the City could realistically do related to the development of an offshore wind project. For any wind development project you need five main things: land to build the project, power purchase agreement, interconnection agreement, transmission to entity who is going to buy it and money to develop the project. Transmission is not an issue in this case since we are already by a large metropolitan area where the energy can be used. It was stated that the City at this time cannot give the developer the land, enter into a power purchase agreement, or enter into an interconnection agreement. Furthermore, the City does not have the financial resources to loan the developer. So the remaining option is to identify an appropriate “carrot” that could be used to encourage a developer to get involved in the project, if the City was so inclined to do so. For many of these items, the City could work to stop or prevent them from being granted, but the City does not have the ability to grant them to a developer.

D. Overview of past Evanston offshore wind development activities

Nicolai Schousboe, Committee Co-Chair, provided the committee an overview of the past wind development activities. A detailed timeline of past activities is provided as Attachment A to the meeting minutes. Mr. Schousboe reminded the group that the wind farm project resulted from citizen involvement in the preparation of the City’s Climate Action Plan and identification of projects that could help reduce the City’s greenhouse gas emissions.

E. Review of current offshore wind development concept

Nate Kipnis provided an overview of the current offshore wind development concept for the committee. He recommended that all members review the FAQ document that CGE has developed which summarizes the details on the current proposed concept for the offshore wind project.

Mr. Kipnis stated that the CGE Renewable Energy Task Force was looking for projects to lower Evanston’s Carbon Footprint without spending any money. He stated that in the area of renewable, the Task Force reviewed available resources and identified wind as an asset of the community. Mr. Kipnis also stated that the Task Force felt that the City of Evanston was a progressive community with the campus and parks, but only 50 houses on the lake and that an
offshore wind project could be a good answer. The initial size of the proposed wind farm that the Task Force considered was smaller but they were given feedback by Northwestern University that it should be larger, more of a utility scale project.

Mr. Kipnis further expanded on the experience that the citizens groups had as they further researched and investigated the potential for an offshore wind development project. Initial analysis of available information continued to indicate that there could be good potential for generating windpower in Lake Michigan offshore of the City of Evanston and that a site at that location would have advantages, such as a shallow shelf of the lake bed that would decrease the depth of the foundations needed. Mr. Kipnis stated that he believed there is an opportunity to get a data collection from a device off of the water intake cribs at Chicago.

Mr. Kipnis commented that their Task Force always knew that the City of Evanston does not own the lake bed nor does the City want to invest money in the project. However the renewable energy portfolio standard in Illinois makes this project attractive. Mr. Kipnis stated that the Task Force believed the RFI is the only thing that the City was really in the position to do in relationship to the offshore wind project. He also mentioned that when the proposed project was originally publicized, there was a lot of interest but that he expects most developers decided to wait until there was actually an offer of a contract on the table. Mr. Kipnis stated that a developer would probably question why they should spend $30,000 – $40,000 now when there is no legal process to develop offshore wind in Illinois and no project at hand.

Mr. Kipnis told the committee that individually one wind farm is not going to handle peak demand, but said that as part of a larger network one wind farm can be part of the solution. He also added that the Task Force observed that all other offshore wind projects are near large educational institutions so locating it by Northwestern University seemed like a logical idea.

F. Discussion of wind RFI review methodology

Mr. Siegfriedt stated that he believes that the committee should strive to provide the City Council with the best available information surrounding the development of an offshore wind project and suggested that the committee’s first task be to create a list of all of the issues associated with the project and describe how each of the two respondents addressed these issues or topics. In addition, the committee could add details on how the committee understands each of these issues and what steps are necessary to address them.

Mr. Siegfriedt stated that the facts need to be addressed and some realities need to be addressed including the realities of the benefits, costs and impacts. In addition, the goals of the City need to be stated and how the project would address those goals needs to be identified.

Mr. Siegfriedt listed issues or topics that he felt the group could use as a starting point to review and make comments on the responses to the RFI. These include the following: Project siting, sizing of the facility, technology, equipment sourcing, facility ownership, operations and maintenance, role of the City of Evanston, and politics.

The committee was in agreement to move forward with this process and decided to break the large committee into working groups which could meet over the next 30 days to develop a document to address their issue/topic area. Based on the number of people on the committee and number of issues/topics, the committee decided that the issues/topics would be grouped
into sets of 2 and the committee members volunteered to serve on one of the four resulting groups. The resulting working-group composition is outlined below.

Project Siting and Size of Facility: T. Carey, T. Cushing, N. Kipnis, W. Wagner
Technology and Equipment Sourcing: D. Dworak, K. Glynn, K. Landry, T. Patton
Role of the City of Evanston and Politics: J. Darin, V. Hutchen, J. Jaskulski, R. Lanyon, N. Schousboe, J. Smith

The output of each working group is intended to be a document which fleshes out the issues assigned to each group, how each of the RFI respondents addressed the issue and input from the working group on how to further address the issues. A draft document from each of the working groups should be completed by May 1st.

In addition to addressing how the RFI respondents each of the issues listed, it was suggested that an evaluation also be made to determine how each of the organizations would actually be able to complete the work under this project and how qualified they were to meet the project requirements.

Mr. Siegfriedt also suggested that the committee plan a tour to visit an existing land-based wind farm and observe this wind farm from 7 miles away to simulate how an offshore wind project might look from the City of Evanston's lakefront. There is a wind farm located in Indiana that could be visited by the committee following the initial output of the working groups. Ms. Hurley stated that the City Manager mentioned he would be supportive of such a field trip and could help coordinate transportation. The committee was in favor of this type of field trip and Mr. Siegfriedt will coordinate the details.

G. Future Meeting Schedule

Ms. Hurley asked if there were any particular times and days that were best for the committee to meet. Feedback was provided that morning times should be included as an option in addition to later times in the evening.

H. Next meeting agenda and pre-work

Ms. Hurley stated that she will use the doodle tool to schedule the next committee meeting in approximately 30 days from today and she will propose a wide range of meeting dates and times. Mr. Schousboe and Mr. Siegfriedt will coordinate the scheduling of meetings for the working groups.

7. COMMUNICATIONS
None

8. ADJOURNMENT
Meeting was adjourned at 8:15 pm.
Appendix A – Timeline of Activities in Evanston

Offshore Wind Power Generation on Lake Michigan

October 2006 - COE City Council unanimously voted to sign the US Mayor's Climate Protection Agreement, pledging reduce greenhouse gas emissions 7% from the 1990 levels by 2012.

May 2007 - Office of Sustainability is created shortly after the City’s Strategic Plan identified environmental sustainability as one of the three guiding values for the City.

Fall 2007 - COE completed a greenhouse gas emission inventory, which revealed a 13% reduction in Evanston greenhouse gas emissions was needed by 2012 to meet this goal.

Fall 2007 - City of Evanston partnered with the Network for Evanston’s Future, a local coalition of citizens’ groups, to jointly develop a climate action plan through a citizen-based process. A climate action plan outlines strategies for reducing a community's greenhouse gas emissions.

Winter 2008 – 9 Task forces formed to research and develop strategies for the Climate Action Plan.

May 2008 - recommended strategies were presented for community comment at an Earth Day event attended by over 300 people.

Fall 2008 - ECAP passed by the Evanston City Council with the first version of the Offshore Wind Farm project included.

November 2008 – The Evanston Climate Action Plan (ECAP), accepted by City Council. Includes recommendation that [the City] “Investigate the feasibility of offshore wind power generation in Lake Michigan.” The development of renewable power at this scale has great potential for reducing Evanston’s greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

Calendar Year 2009, 2010 - Implementation of Evanston Climate Action Plan begins – COE working on both City operations as well as collaboration with the community on a variety of projects; during this time COE was also awarded the EECBG and began efficiency projects.

Spring 2010 – The Citizens’ for a Greener Evanston (CGE), an advocacy group of community members involved in developing the ECAP, has been researching offshore wind generation on Lake Michigan for several years. Based upon CGE’s findings, the Staff recommended City Council approval to issue a Request for Information.

April 13, 2010 - Evanston City Council unanimously authorized issuing a Request for Information (RFI) to interested parties for the solicitation of information on developing an offshore wind energy facility in Lake Michigan off the northern shore of Evanston.
The purpose of the RFI was to determine the feasibility of offshore wind power generation off Evanston’s Lake Michigan border by identifying potential partners, determining the City’s role and gaining a comprehensive understanding of the steps required for the development of a renewable energy facility off Evanston’s Lake Michigan shore.

**May 1, 2010** – RFI released by the City of Evanston; interested parties have until June 30th to submit a response. The RFI is not a contract offer by the City. The City reserves the right to discontinue or modify the RFI process at any time, and makes no commitments, implied or otherwise, that this process will result in a business transaction or negotiation with one or more responders. Responders are advised that the City will not pay any cost incurred in response to this RFI.

**June 30, 2010** - COE received three RFI submittals before the June 30, 2010 deadline. Two of these submittals were from developers and the third was from a consulting company offering assistance with the project. Since the primary objective of the RFI was to identify interested developers, the consulting firm response is not recommended to be pursued.

**July 2010** - CGE organized a Wind Farm Presentation and forum to share facts and answer questions relative to the proposal. About 100 local residents, business owners, energy professionals and students attended the event.

**September 13, 2010** - Citizens Utility Board (CUB - Illinois) published the results of a survey of Illinois residents regarding the proposal of a wind farm on Lake Michigan. 2,140 people were interviewed by phone or email. [Click here](#) for survey results.

**October 11, 2010** – Presentation by Wind RFI respondents to City Council: Off Grid Technologies, Inc. (OGT) and Mercury Wind Energy (MWe) were asked to make brief presentations about their companies at the October 11, 2010 City Council meeting.

**December 6, 2010** – Rules Committee agreed on the creation of a special community to review the two responses to the RFI and provide feedback to City Council. The committee should include members of the community, including our experts currently serving on our other boards and commissions and community groups.

**December 9, 2010** – City of Evanston announces the solicitation of volunteers for the wind farm committee. The deadline for submitting an application is January 7th.

**January 7, 2011** – Wind Farm Committee application deadline. Over 53 individuals submitted a formal request to serve on the committee.

**January- February 2011** – Mayor Tisdahl reviews the wind farm applicants and selects 21 community members to serve on the committee.

**March 14, 2011**– Wind Farm Committee members are approved at the City Council Meeting.
Spring 2011 - House Bill 1558 and Senate Bill 1314 is introduced by Rep. Gabel and Sen. Schoenberg to create the Lake Michigan Offshore Wind Energy Council as a separate entity within the Department of Natural Resources. The members of this council will be the Director of Natural Resources, the Director of the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, the Director of the Illinois Power Agency, the Chairman of the Illinois Commerce Commission, or their designees, public members selected by the Director of Natural Resources and House and Senate leadership.

The purpose of the Council is to examine all challenges and possible benefits related to offshore wind energy facilities on Lake Michigan, and report the findings to the Governor and General Assembly by December 31, 2011.

Spring 2011 – City of Waukegan collaborates with City of Evanston, Illinois; the College of Lake County; a four-year accredited educational institution; and Lake County Partners, an economic development organization to apply for a research grant under the DOE Grant titled U.S. Offshore Wind – Removing Market Barriers DE-FOA-0000414. As part of this grant, a non-profit, public-private partnership titled NEIROWI, Northeastern Illinois Regional Offshore Wind Investigation with the goal of creating a coalition to further investigate and advance the development of an offshore wind generation facility on the west shore of Lake Michigan.