



# Omaha Together One Community (OTOC) Score Card for OPPD 2018



	Subdivision 1		Subdivision 6		Subdivision 8
	Amanda Bogner	Kristine Dungan	Tom Barrett	Eric Williams	Linda Duckworth
<p><b>Question 1:</b> Will you support an investment to increase the number of charging stations for electric vehicles in Omaha by 100 in three years?</p>	<p>“I think absolutely OPPD should have a leadership role in encouraging electric vehicles in our community” Good opportunity for name recognition, revenue, and to move the community forward in new technology. OPPD can’t do it alone- need other stakeholders on things like who will pay the electricity bill and where stations should be located</p>	<p>“I would definitely support the District pursuing private partnerships with EV manufacturers to work toward increasing the number of public charging stations in the area” Share the investment between OPPD and EV manufacturers.</p>	<p>“Yes I would support more charging stations, however, when you look at the state of Nebraska, there are 700 EV Vehicles...you’re taking public money for potentially a private good” OPPD should partner with businesses, but we shouldn’t sink large amounts of OPPD funds into it. People can charge at home.</p>	<p>“Yes, I support more electric chargers and if elected to the board I would work to see them implemented” Other Midwest cities are recognizing the revenue potentials of more charging stations- 100 in Lincoln, 1000 in Kansas City. It brings revenue back to the utility rather than having petroleum money leaving and having higher emissions.</p>	<p>Yes. As homes and businesses become more energy efficient and more people adopt residential solar, EV presents an opportunity to make up that difference in sales of electricity. This will help keep costs down for families and businesses (a major concern from this subdivision) while supporting clean transportation.</p>
<p><b>Question 2:</b> Will you direct OPPD staff to work with groups that want to develop community solar projects using tools like virtual net metering?</p>	<p>Yes, language in the proposed SD 7 directs staff to work on innovative programs and community solar would be just that. The net metering rate structure also needs to be revisited to provide fair value to those installing solar.</p>	<p>Yes and No, it depends on how you define it. All potential projects need to be assessed for cost effectiveness, how they impact OPPD’s balance portfolio, and the safety and reliability guidelines in place.</p>	<p>Yes and No, it depends on how you define it. Utility wide solar is best because management has analyzed that and concluded such. Affordability is my main priority, and these projects need to help the bottom line.</p>	<p>Yes, support community solar. I support utility scale solar as well as small distributed solar on homes and business rooftops. Three things community solar should include: 1, significant and ongoing community involvement, 2, connection between energy production and bill of participants and 3, possibility for positive financial return.</p>	<p>Yes, optimistic about the potential of solar power, whether used on individual homes, utility scale, or through community groups working on solar projects. Great way to help OPPD be customer-friendly. Need to encourage communication and collaboration.</p>

<p><b>Question 3:</b> Will you work to lower OPPD monthly service fee to a level that is in line with comparable Midwest cities?</p>	<p>Fixed fee disproportionately affects low income and people that strive to make their home energy efficient. This decision was an inappropriate choice. National trend for fixed fees to cover system fees as well as the service fees, so other cities will probably be increasing. But, OPPD's is still way too high, and yes it should be reconsidered.</p>	<p>I understand the need for a fixed fee, but these high service fees don't seem fair. I want to know why the service fee is so high, the background for the decision, and compare it comparable cities before deciding whether to reconsider for a lower fee.</p>	<p>"I voted against it" It never made sense to me. Burden is on low energy users and low income users. Would vote to have it overturned in next session</p>	<p>"Yes, I would work to decrease the fixed fee on the bill" The higher fixed fee has disproportionate negative impact on low energy users, low- moderate income homes, and fixed income homes. Regressive rates- those that use the most pay the least. Other states have regulated this, and we need to watch it. There has not been very little outreach to the people negatively affected by this decision since 2015.</p>	<p>"There is no justification for fees that are so out of line with comparable cities" Though rates haven't been raised, the fees have and voters she's talked to think their bill too high. These fees take away the power of the rate payers to manage their use and how much they pay for it.</p>
<p><b>Question 4:</b> Do you support reducing carbon intensity by 20% by 2030? Would you go further?</p>	<p>"I am very much in favor of the strategic directive and how it's been rewritten" 20% is just the starting point. Eventually, it needs to be 0% How to do that: -How we generate electricity without emissions - energy efficiency programs - grid technologies (better ways to store renewables)</p>	<p>"Yes, as a rate payer and potential board member, I support the Districts goal of a 20% reduction" The district needs to keep looking for more ways to reduce emissions, and has done well at meeting good climate goals</p>	<p>Yes, does support reductions. Global warming is causing bigger issues to human lives (hurricanes). It's time for OPPD to do it's small part</p>	<p>Yes. This is a great step since OPPD doesn't have a climate change policy. Climate change is happening, it is caused by humans, the consequences will be severe and we should take immediate and direct action. Also need to be looking at total carbon emissions and eventually 100% renewable energy</p>	<p>I support this goal because it appears very doable. I am convinced that changes will continue to happen in the energy industry at a rapid pace, and most of those changes will be in forms of generation that produce zero emissions. As we get closer to 2030, need to revisit the goal. My guess is we will be able to do more, affordably.</p>